

REMARKS

In response to the above-identified Office Action, Applicant seeks reconsideration of the application. In this response, no claims have been canceled, no claims have been added, and Claims 2, 4-7 and 10 have been amended. Accordingly, Claims 1-10 are pending.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,841,354 issued to Inaba (Inaba) in view of Applicant's prior art. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant first notes that, to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the cited references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination must be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Claim 1 recites patterning a signal line from a metal material as a terminal conductive layer of an integrated circuit die; patterning a first protective structure to surround the signal line; and patterning a second protective structure to surround the first protective structure. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Inaba and Applicant's prior art fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in Claim 1.

In rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner relies on Inaba to show a protective structure 4 surrounding internal wiring leads 2a as shown in figure 13 of Inaba. In response, Applicant notes that Inaba fails to disclose patterning a second protective structure to surround the first protective structure, as recited in Claim 1. Although, Inaba shows a first protective structure 4 to surround a signal line, Inaba does not teach patterning a second protective structure to surround the first protective structure. Applicant's prior art also does not disclose patterning a first protective structure to surround a signal line and patterning a second protective structure to surround the first protective structure, as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, the combination of Inaba and Applicant's prior art fails to disclose every limitation of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent Claim 1.

With respect to Claim 2, Applicant has amended this claim to further recite patterning the second protective structure as a continuous structure to enclose the first protective structure. Since the combination of Inaba and Applicant's prior art fails to disclose patterning the first protective structure as a continuous structure to enclose the signal line, and patterning the second protective structure as a continuous structure to enclose the first protective

structure as recited in Claim 2, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 2 is allowable over Inaba in view of Applicant's prior art.

As to independent Claim 4, Applicant has amended this claim to further recite forming a second protective structure that surrounds the first protective structure. Since the combination of Inaba and Applicant's prior art fails to disclose forming a second protective structure that surrounds the first protective structure as recited in Claim 4, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 4 is allowable over Inaba in view of Applicant's prior art.

With respect to Claim 5, Applicant has amended this claim to further recite that forming the second protective structure comprises using a continuous loop-like protective structure to enclose the first protective structure. Since the combination of Inaba and Applicant's prior art fails to disclose forming the second protective structure using a continuous loop-like protective structure to enclose the first protective structure as recited in Claim 5, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 5 is allowable over Inaba in view of Applicant's prior art.

As to Claims 8 and 9, these claims are dependent on Claim 4. Therefore Applicant submits that dependent Claims 8 and 9 are not obvious in view of Inaba and Applicant's prior art at least for the same reasons given in connection with their base Claim 4.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 3, 6, 7 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Inaba in view of Applicant's prior art and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,078,068 issued to Tamara (Tamara). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As Claims 3, 6, 7 and 10 are each respectively dependent on independent Claims 1 and 4, the discussion above with regard to the independent claims and Inaba applies here. Because the combination of Inaba and Applicant's prior art does not contain limitations recited in Applicant's independent claims as set forth above, and because Tamara does not cure these deficiencies, the combination of Inaba, Applicant's prior art and Tamara does not teach or suggest Applicant's dependent claims. Therefore, Claims 3, 6, 7 and 10 are patentable over Inaba in view of Applicant's prior art and Tamara.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees. If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this Application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Dated: March 3, 2004




Walter T. Kim, Reg. No. 42,731

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on March 03, 2004.

Marilyn Bass



March 03, 2004